

83D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. CON. RES. 42

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 20 (legislative day, JULY 6), 1953

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives*
2 *concurring)*, That there is hereby established a Joint Com-
3 mittee on Central Intelligence to be composed of nine Mem-
4 bers of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the
5 Senate, and nine Members of the House of Representatives
6 to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representa-
7 tives. In each instance not more than five members shall
8 be members of the same political party.

9 SEC. 2. The joint committee shall make continuing
10 studies of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency
11 and of problems relating to the gathering of intelligence
12 affecting the national security and of its coordination and

1 utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instru-
2 mentalities of the Government. The Central Intelligence
3 Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently
4 informed with respect to its activities. All bills, resolutions,
5 and other matters in the Senate or the House of Repre-
6 sentatives relating primarily to the Central Intelligence
7 Agency shall be referred to the joint committee. The mem-
8 bers of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate
9 shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members
10 of the joint committee who are Members of the House of
11 Representatives shall from time to time report to the House,
12 by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to
13 matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses
14 which are (1) referred to the joint committee or (2) other-
15 wise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

16 SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint com-
17 mittee shall not affect the power of the remaining members
18 to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be
19 filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selec-
20 tion. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a
21 vice chairman from among its members.

22 SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized
23 subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to
24 sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpoena
25 or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the pro-

1 duction of such books, papers, and documents, to administer
2 such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing
3 and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems
4 advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such
5 hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

6 SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint
7 such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and steno-
8 graphic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The
9 committee is authorized to utilize the services, information,
10 facilities, and personnel of the departments and establish-
11 ments of the Government.

12 SEC. 6. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall
13 not exceed \$ per year, shall be paid one-half from
14 the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the con-
15 tingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers
16 signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such ex-
17 penses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of
18 the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to
19 be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of
20 Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disburse-
21 ments so made.

Approved For Release 2005/04/13 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600020015-4

83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. CON. RES. 42

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Establishing a Joint Committee on Central
Intelligence.

By Mr. MANSFIELD

JULY 20 (legislative day, JULY 6), 1953
Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

Approved For Release 2005/04/13 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600020015-4

1954

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3173

H. R. 4864. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Noel;
 H. R. 5090. An act for the relief of Mrs. Magdalene Zarnovski Austin;
 H. R. 5436. An act for the relief of David Hanan;
 H. R. 5460. An act for the relief of Chaney C. Newsom;
 H. R. 5933. An act for the relief of Herschel P. Reagan;
 H. R. 5961. An act for the relief of Mari- anne Schuster Dawes;
 H. R. 6563. An act for the relief of Zdzislaw (Jerzy) Jazwinski;
 H. R. 6647. An act for the relief of Yoko Kagawa;
 H. R. 6754. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hooley Shee Eng;
 H. R. 7258. An act for the relief of the Willmore Engineering Co.;
 H. R. 7452. An act for the relief of Therese Boehner Soisson;
 H. R. 7753. An act for the relief of the estate of Carlo de Luca;
 H. R. 8315. An act to limit the operation of sections 281 and 283 of Title 18, United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U. S. C. 99) with respect to counsel in a certain case; and
 H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 H. R. 3854. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Turn- again Arm Community Club of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
 H. R. 8367. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the De- partment of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL IN- TELLIGENCE — ADDITIONAL CO- SPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RES- OLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Da- kota [Mr. LANGER], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PORTER], and the junior Senator from Washing- ton [Mr. JACKSON] be added as additional cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Reso- lution 69, providing for the establish- ment of a joint Committee on Central Intelligence. The concurrent resolution was submitted by me on March 10.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there ob- jection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS BEFORE WATER TRANSPORTATION SUB- COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COM- MITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. Presi- dent, the Water Transportation Subcom- mittee of the Senate Interstate and For- eign Commerce Committee has arranged for a series of public hearings on bills pending before it, to which all interested parties are invited.

The dates of the hearings and the bills to be considered are as follows:

March 19, 10 a. m.: S. 1148 and S. 1878, dealing with war risk insurance.

March 22, 2:30 p. m.: S. 2814, to au- thorize changes in the rules for compu- tation of net tonnage in certain vessels.

March 23, 10 a. m.: S. 602, to provide for greater safety at sea by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pre- scribe rules for the loading and stowage of grain and other similar bulk cargoes.

March 29, 10 a. m.: S. 2072, providing for annual inspections, and so forth, of certain passenger vessels, and S. 2818, authorizing biennial inspections of hulls and boilers of cargo vessels.

In accordance with custom, it is speci- fied that prospective witnesses send to the committee in advance copies of their testimony.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address entitled "The Struggle for a Free Asia," delivered by him at the annual For- eign Policy Institute, at the University of Pennsylvania, on March 16, 1954.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Jackson Day dinner address delivered by Senator SYMINGTON at Des Moines, Iowa, on March 13, 1954.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address delivered by him before the con- vention of the National Hadassah at Miami Beach, March 14, 1954.

Editorial entitled "Meet Your Congress- man," referring to Representative HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., published in the Spring- field (N. J.) Sun of February 25, 1954.

By Mr. HENNING:

Address delivered by him before the Eco- nomic Club of New York.

Address delivered by him at a Jefferson- Jackson Day dinner held in Midland, Tex.

Article entitled "They Are Putting Cancer In Your Food," dealing with chemical addi- tives used in food, published in the January 1954 issue of the National Police Gazette.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Article entitled "Policy for Security and Peace," prepared by Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, for publication in the April issue of Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Editorial entitled "Reciprocal Trade Bill," published in the Dallas Morning News of March 9, 1954.

By Mr. HOEY:

Article entitled "Battle of Ramsour's Mill Was Strange But Potent," written by Clyde Osborne, and published in the Charlotte Ob- server of March 14, 1954.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Article by John M. Cummings, entitled "Twill Be a Fine Night for St. Patrick's Sons," published in the Philadelphia In- quirer on March 17, 1954.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Editorial entitled "Look Who's Talking," from the Washington Daily News of March 17, 1954, with reference to the President's tax-reduction program.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Resolution adopted by the Montgomery County Chapter of Americans for Democratic Action, endorsing and urging the enactment of the code of fair committee procedure for the Congress of the United States recently introduced by Senator MORSE and Senator LEHMAN.

Editorial entitled "The Pied Piper and His Fee," published in the San Francisco Chron- icle on March 7, 1954.

Article by Walter Lippmann, entitled "What Now?" published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 8, 1954.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR TUBERCULO- SIS GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS— LETTER FROM PRESIDENT OF WISCONSIN ANTITUBERCULOSIS ASSOCIATION, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a message from Mr. Anthony F. Berens, S. J., president of the Wis- consin Antituberculosis Association.

Reverend Berens has sent a signifi- cant message on the issue of adequate Federal grants-in-aid during the coming fiscal year for tuberculosis control pur- poses.

I believe the letter will be of interest to Senators and I ask unanimous con- sent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WISCONSIN ANTITUBERCULOSIS ASSOCIATION,
 Milwaukee, Wis., March 10, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your attention is respect- fully drawn to the proposal that the Public Health Service budget for tuberculosis be reduced in 1954-55 to \$3,500,000 from the \$6 million appropriated in 1953-54.

The Wisconsin State Board of Health this year is receiving approximately \$62,000 as a Federal grant for tuberculosis control. Most of this money is used to finance the opera- tion of mobile X-ray units for the early dis- covery of tuberculosis.

The board of directors of the Wisconsin Antituberculosis Association feels that the individual States should finance their own tuberculosis-control programs. We are con- cerned, however, about the problem which the proposed reduction will create in Wiscon- sin. The State legislature, along with the legislatures of 32 other States, will not meet again in regular session until 1955. Hence, there will be no opportunity to compensate for the decrease in Federal funds by in- creasing the State appropriation. Employees working on the mobile-unit program would leave after June 30, 1954, leading to the termination of much or all of this important preventive service.

Our board therefore urges that the grant- in-aid portion of the Public Health Service tuberculosis budget remain at the 1953-54 figure until the Wisconsin legislature can take action.

Very truly yours,

A. F. BERENS, President.

WOOL PRODUCTION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that present domestic production of wool would be less than the military needs alone, in the event of war, we should be cutting off from all foreign sources of supply. The Secretary of Agriculture has recommended an in- centive plan which, with some minor amendments, has been unanimously re- ported by the Senate Committee on Agri- culture and Forestry. The committee report frankly admits that if the inen- tive plan works as well as contemplated, it would still take at least 10 years to bring domestic production of wool back to the previous level of 300 million pounds a year. I am convinced that no price support, plus incentive payments from Federal funds to bring fluctuating domestic prices up to the level of a fair return to the producers, will accomplish

the desired results, unless and until there is worked out a plan to protect sheep raisers from losses sustained from predators. For many years the Federal Government has been spending \$900,000, or more, a year on predator control, primarily in the West for the elimination of coyotes. In the East the problem is sheep-killing dogs.

I am sending to each Member of the Senate a letter in which I discuss this problem, because it stands to reason that more wool cannot be clipped until more sheep are produced, and certainly in the East it is impossible to produce more sheep without protection from predators. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from our State department of agriculture discussing the problem confronting us in Virginia, and an amendment, which I intend to offer if Senators from other States interested in this program will join me in sponsoring it.

There being no objection, the letter and amendment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AND IMMIGRATION,
Richmond, March 15, 1954.
Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Thank you for your letter of March 13 asking about the stray dog situation with reference to our Virginia sheep industry.

Mr. Brinkley is out of town until Friday, but he has asked me to write you in respect to this matter.

With respect to your statement that there were more sheep in Virginia in 1860 than there are today I am enclosing the figures from our records which go back to 1867, and very definitely prove your contention. As you can see from the sheet, we had 510,000 head in 1867 as against 324,000 in 1954.

Certainly we should have seen an expansion in Virginia's sheep industry during this period. We have good sheep country and the overall sheep picture from an economic standpoint would certainly warrant considerable increase.

As far as we can determine the largest single detriment to sheep raising in Virginia is the loss from predatory animals, of which dogs make up the vast majority.

The department of game and inland fisheries tells us that there are between 450,000 and 500,000 licensed dogs in Virginia, and that the figure is increasing at the rate of about 5 percent each year. This means that there are about 4 dogs for every 3 sheep in Virginia, and these figures do not include unlicensed dogs. This increase continues despite the fact that about 40,000 dogs each year are destroyed by game wardens and another 10,000 picked up off the highway by the State highway department.

This gives some idea of the problem. The other half of the problem is illustrated by the fact that Virginia's counties and cities during the fiscal year 1952-53 paid over \$90,000 in indemnities for animals killed by predators. The department of game and inland fisheries believes that by far the largest portion of this amount was paid for damage done by dogs.

In response to a tremendous demand by farm interest there was introduced in the 1954 Virginia General Assembly a bill which would have authorized county boards of supervisors to transfer money from county general funds into the county dog fund from which indemnities are paid whenever the indemnity fund is exhausted. This bill

was backed by the agricultural conference board and other farm organizations, but was killed in committee under pressure from county supervisors who said that this would seriously undermine county revenues because demands would be so large. One of the bill's opponents stated that in one southwest Virginia county there were pending some \$7,000 in claims for livestock lost to predators, for which there was no money available.

On the other hand, the counties of Augusta and Albemarle do have authorization to transfer money from general fund to dog fund, but we have no information on how this is working out.

So far as we can determine here the largest single incentive to increase our sheep numbers would be some solution to the stray dog problem. As far as we can determine the approach which you have in mind would be a good one on the standpoint of sheep production, and certainly there is great need, for some sort of additional indemnity money.

We would suggest, as I understand you have in mind, that the Federal money be on some sort of a matching basis in order to facilitate administrative control.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. WESSELLS, Jr.,
Special Assistant to the Commissioner.

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. ROBERTSON to the bill (S. 2911) to provide for the development of a sound and profitable domestic wool industry under our national policy of expanding world trade to encourage increased domestic production of wool for our national security, and for other purposes, viz: At the end of the bill, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 10. The Secretary of Agriculture shall, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, reimburse any State, or local governmental subdivision thereof, one-half of all amounts paid by the State or local governmental subdivision, pursuant to a State or local law or ordinance, to sheep owners for losses suffered by their flocks by mountain lions, bears, dogs, coyotes, foxes, or other predatory animals. Payment of such reimbursements shall be made at such times, but not less often than once each marketing year, as the Secretary may prescribe, upon the submission by the State or local governmental subdivision of such evidence of payments made by the State or local governmental subdivision as the Secretary may require."

On page 3, line 16, strike out "all such payments made under this act" and in lieu thereof insert "all payments made under this section and section 10 of this act."

On page 4, line 24, strike out "under this act" and in lieu thereof insert "under section 4 and to States or local governmental subdivisions under section 10."

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am reading in the newspapers various criticisms and comments on the address on our taxation situation delivered night before last by the President of the United States. This morning there appeared in the New York Times a very interesting editorial, entitled "Impregnable Position," on that subject. In light of the pending discussion—and I hope to address myself to the subject, later on—at this time I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPREGNABLE POSITION

Last night Democratic leaders took to the airwaves in an effort to reply to the previous night's broadcast by President Eisenhower and to justify their proposals for increasing personal exemptions under the individual income tax by anywhere from \$100 to \$400.

Nothing in these arguments alters our conviction that basically the conflict here is between election-year political expediency on the one hand and sound public policy on the other. The pillars on which President Eisenhower's position is based remain intact and unshaken. These pillars are:

1. The President's tax program is a logical and integrated part of the administration's stated overall economic and fiscal policies—policies which alone have made any tax reduction possible. The proposed tax bonus offered by the President's opponents is strangely at variance with the attitude of fiscal self-righteousness displayed by some of its advocates only a few months ago when the President asked authority from Congress to raise the debt limit.

2. The new omnibus tax bill, which would be made the vehicle for the proposed George amendment, is not simply another revenue measure. It is a comprehensive revision of the Nation's tax laws, and the first undertaken in half a century. That the changes it calls for would result in relief for the individual, the investor, and industry is a natural, if indirect, consequence of its reform character and the purposes actuating its reforms. These purposes are two: (1) the removal of inequities, and (2) the removal of unnecessary obstacles to business expansion—which is to say jobmaking.

3. To introduce into this measure a haphazard across-the-board tax bonus such as the George plan would (1) plunge the country back overnight into the mire of budgetary deficits from which the administration has been valiantly trying to extricate it, and (2) violate one of the fundamental tenets of sound tax policy by wiping out at a stroke the tax liability—and accompanying sense of public responsibility—of 1 out of every 3 persons now paying an income tax.

THE LATE MAJ. GEN. KENNETH F. CRAMER

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I had intended to pay tribute to the late Gen. Kenneth F. Cramer, who died recently. In order to save time I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement prepared by me, and a short summary of his life, as printed in the Bureau Drawer, the publication of the National Guard Bureau, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and biographical summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

I rise to pay tribute to one of the Nation's most distinguished citizen-soldiers, a gentleman who contributed much to his country, his State, and his community before his recent death.

I refer to the late Maj. Gen. Kenneth F. Cramer, a National Guard man from Connecticut and a great American. At the time of his unexpected death from a heart attack on February 19, he was commanding general of the Southern Area Command in Germany and formerly commanded the 43d Infantry Division stationed there. The division is composed of National Guard men from Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

General Cramer was a staunch American of the highest principles. He distinguished himself in combat in two wars, in which he won many decorations for personal valor.

SECRET

2. It is noted that S. Con. Res. 69, the Mansfield resolution has been referred to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration rather than to the Senate Armed Services Committee, to which S. Con. Res. 42, Sen. Mansfield's previous resolution, was referred in July. In view of the fact that the previous resolution was referred to Armed Services, Sen. Saltonstall should get a re-referral of S. Con. Res. 69 to his Committee. Sen. Jenner is Chairman of the Rules Committee, of which Sen. McCarthy is also a member. *12 March 1954*

SECRET

10 March 1954

Memorandum for: The Director of Central Intelligence

Subject: Joint Congressional Committee
on Central Intelligence.

Senator Mansfield this afternoon introduced S. Concurrent Resolution 69, to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Central Intelligence. The bill was co-sponsored by 21 Senators -- 5 Republicans and 16 Democrats. The co-sponsors are as follows:

Frank A. Barrett (R., Wyo.)	Olin D. Johnston (D., S. Car.)
Thomas A. Burke (D., Ohio)	Harley M. Kilgore (D., W. Va.)
John M. Butler (R., Md.)	Herbert H. Lehman (D., N. Y.)
Homer E. Capehart (R., Ind.)	Burnet R. Maybank (D., S. Car.)
Earle C. Clements (D., Ky.)	Edward Martin (R., Penn.)
Price Daniel (D., Tex.)	Karl E. Mundt (R., S. Dak.)
J. W. Fulbright (D., Ark.)	James E. Murray (D., Mont.)
Walter F. George (D., Ga.)	Matthew M. Neely (D., V. Va.)
Guy M. Gillette (D., Iowa)	John O. Pastore (D., R. I.)
Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.)	
Edwin C. Johnson (D., Colo.)	

The printed text of the Resolution will not be available until sometime tomorrow.

Walter L. Pforzheimer
Legislative Counsel

I wish also to commend the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration [Mr. JENNER] for the position he has taken as chairman of the committee in calling the committee together to consider the report on next Tuesday.

I think the action on the part of both Senators is proper. The case should be closed. Final action should be taken on it, and I hope that can be done next week.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the Senator that it was only with the full cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration and the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], that it was possible to expedite this matter. We also had the cooperation of the staff of the committee.

While I shall not at this time propound a unanimous-consent request, I am hopeful that when the subject is brought to the attention of the Senate, Senators on the other side of the aisle will explore the situation to see if we cannot arrive at a reasonable division of time for a couple of days, or whatever time it may be felt is necessary to debate the question, so that the attention of the Senate may be concentrated on that subject. I hope it will not be delayed by extraneous matters. I believe that when the seat of any United States Senator is at stake he and the State he represents, as well as the Senate, are entitled to have as prompt action as the facts developed will warrant.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I can speak for only one Member of the Senate. I believe that Senators on this side of the aisle will desire only sufficient time to present the case of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] in the proper light.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In order that the distinguished majority leader may be fully advised, let me say to him that the calling of Calendar No. 703, Senate bill 796, would entail considerable debate, of such length that perhaps it could not be concluded in 1 day, whereas Calendar 1032, House bill 5509, might well be disposed of within a much briefer time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did not necessarily mean the bills would be called up in the order mentioned. I am mindful of the fact that undoubtedly there will be some debate. What I have in mind is this: If debate runs out today after the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] speaks on a different subject, I wish to be in a position to proceed to the consideration of certain other bills.

Tomorrow the time will be controlled under the unanimous-consent agreement. The vote is to come at 4 o'clock. We can then return to the consideration of whatever is the unfinished business at that time, and the debate on the two bills referred to can be continued on Friday, if necessary.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

No. 45—3

Mr. BUSH. With respect to Calendar No. 703, Senate bill 796, I advise the majority leader that I had not realized that he was about to bring up that bill. Frankly, I am not prepared to debate the bill at this time, but I may be prepared in 24 or 48 hours. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] that consideration of Senate bill 796 should be postponed, if possible. I shall be glad to advise the majority leader as soon as we are ready to have it considered. There are certain points of difference. Minority views have been filed and we are in the process of trying to reach an agreement which will accommodate the minority point of view, which would make the bill generally more acceptable.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We have discussed the bill from time to time. I certainly have no desire to move ahead if the distinguished Senator from Connecticut is not prepared to do so this afternoon. I wished to give notice that the bill should be taken up for consideration in the near future. Very soon we shall have a heavy program, including tax legislation, appropriation bills, and major parts of the administration's legislative program, as well as the important measure now pending. I am afraid that if we do not consider the Senator's bill soon it may be lost in the general tieup of the session later. So, if the Senator is hopeful that the bill will be passed, I think the sooner we can get to it the better it will be.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I assure him that I shall be ready within 48 hours to take up the bill at his convenience.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I gave notice that among several bills for which consideration would be sought was Calendar No. 620, Senate bill 2231, a bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims. That was one of the bills with respect to which I had given advance notice to the leadership on the other side of the aisle. We are attempting this afternoon to devise a program to fill in the time when debate on the pending legislation runs out. I should like to be prepared to take up the bill referred during the afternoon.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor. Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator mind if I suggested the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is agreeable to me, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the Senator from Montana losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], my colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence to be composed of 5 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 5 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than three members shall be members of the same political party.

Sec. 2. The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and of problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government. The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Central Intelligence Agency shall be referred to the joint committee. The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to the joint committee or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

Sec. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

Sec. 4. The joint committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is au-

thorized to hold such hearings, so sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

Sec. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistance as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

Sec. 6. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed \$ per year, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution just submitted proposes to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, to be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House. In each instance not more than three members shall be of the same political party.

Mr. President, events during the past year have convinced me that an urgent need exists for regular and responsible congressional scrutiny of the Central Intelligence Agency. Such scrutiny is essential to the success of our foreign policy, to the preservation of our democratic processes, and to the security of the Intelligence Agency itself. The sooner we provide a legislative framework for proper congressional-CIA relations, the quicker we can begin to build mutual confidence.

This is a prerequisite for effective operation by an executive agency, especially one hidden behind closed doors. If we fail to establish some sort of permanent, continuing link between Congress and the CIA the only result will be growing suspicion. From that, in all likelihood, will come sporadic investigations by various committees of Congress.

It should not be surprising that a great many Members of Congress are already questioning the wisdom of continuing to allow almost complete independence to a Government agency as vital and powerful as CIA. In the first place, the whole concept of peacetime foreign intelligence operations has been alien to American tradition. It was not until 1947, when CIA was established, that this Nation began to develop an intelligence service of any significant size. Even then many harbored serious doubts as to whether such an organization belonged in a democracy in peacetime.

Nevertheless, by 1947 most Americans realized that the United States was confronted with a foe which would use any means to attain its aim—the conquest

of the world. Information on the capabilities and intentions of aggressive nations became imperative, especially in view of the developments in atomic energy.

The need for the Central Intelligence Agency is seldom questioned any longer and I certainly am not challenging it now. What I am concerned with, however, is CIA's position of responsibility to none but the National Security Council. I believe this should be changed. It is true that intelligence services of other major countries operate without direct control of the legislatures. This is understandable in a totalitarian government, such as the Soviet Union. It is even understandable in a parliamentary democracy, such as Great Britain, where the entire administration is a part of and is responsible to Parliament. Our form of government, however, is based on a system of checks and balances. If this system gets seriously out of balance at any point the whole system is jeopardized and the way is opened for the growth of tyranny.

There has been almost no congressional inspection of the Central Intelligence Agency since the latter's establishment in 1947. It is conceivable that as the need for an intelligence service had been evident in 1946, the Congressional Reorganization Act of that year would have made provisions for congressional participation in the committee structure of Congress. As it is now, however, CIA is freed from practically every ordinary form of congressional check. Control of its expenditures is exempted from the provisions of law which prevent financial abuses in other Government agencies. Its appropriations are hidden in allotments to other agencies, and the Bureau of the Budget does not report CIA's personnel strength to Congress. Each year only a handful of Members in each House see even the appropriation figures. There is no regular, methodical review of this agency; other than a briefing which is supplied to a few members of the appropriations committees.

Mr. President, I agree that an intelligence agency must maintain complete secrecy to be effective. If clandestine sources of information were inadvertently revealed, they would quickly dry up. Not only would the flow of information be cut off, but the lives of many would be seriously endangered. In addition, much of the value of the intelligence product would be lost if it were known that we possessed it. An example is the breaking of a code. If we break a code we can continue to intercept and decipher important messages as long as the enemy or potential enemy is unaware of our knowledge. However, the instant the enemy learns that we have the key, they will stop using that code or possibly use it only to mislead us. Secrecy for these purposes is obviously necessary.

However, there is a profound difference between an essential degree of secrecy to achieve a specific purpose and secrecy for the mere sake of secrecy. Once secrecy becomes sacrosanct, it invites abuse. If we accept this idea of secrecy for secrecy's sake we will have no

way of knowing whether we have a fine intelligence service or a very poor one.

Secrecy now beclouds everything about CIA—its cost, its efficiency, its successes, and its failures. It has been mustered against questions or proposals regarding CIA by Members of Congress. It is difficult to legislate intelligently for this agency because we have no information which we can be positive is correct.

An aura of superiority has been built around the CIA. Calls for an investigation of CIA personnel have been met with a resistance not encountered from any other agency. The administration appears to support the view that CIA officials merit an immunity which has never been claimed for the State Department or other Government agencies handling equally confidential material. CIA seems to have marked out for itself a setting above other Government agencies, Congress, and the public.

I do not believe that responsible congressional auditing of the CIA is incompatible with the maintenance of the degree of secrecy necessary to the legitimate operations of this agency. On the contrary it has many advantages. It would protect the reputation of the agency against unjustified attacks. It would make unnecessary sporadic investigations which might lead to unauthorized disclosures. Adequate funds would be assured for all legitimate purposes. Most important, the assertion of congressional interest in this field would reduce the threat to our democratic processes which this uncontrolled agency by its very nature now poses.

The kind of congressional role which is called for in this situation is similar to that played by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The resolution which I am introducing today is similar to one I sponsored last July. It proposes the creation of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence. This committee would be composed of 5 Members of the Senate and 5 Members of the House. No more than 3 Members in either House would be selected from the same political party. The committee would make continuing studies of the activities of the Agency, its problems, its utilization by other departments and agencies, and its coordination with them. From time to time the members of the committee would report to the Senate and House and recommend such legislation as might be needed.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy offers a model for congressional participation in the control of CIA. The joint committee deals with a subject that requires at least as much secrecy as would a committee on intelligence. It deals with a subject that is even more vital to our national security.

The Atomic Energy Commission has earned the respect of both the executive and legislative branches of the Government. It has been entrusted with the most vital secrets of state and it has proved worthy of that trust. Other Members of Congress have full confidence in its judgment. Their legislative actions affecting atomic energy are based on the secure knowledge that trusted Members of both Houses are fully cognizant of developments in atomic energy.

They do not have to depend on the unilateral judgment of the executive branch as to what Members of Congress ought or ought not to know.

The Atomic Energy Commission also benefits from its ties with the committee because it provides the commissioners with a clear channel into which they can direct their legislative problems. The security of the atomic energy program, moreover, is not periodically threatened by sporadic investigations and embarrassing questions from the floor of Congress.

I do not believe that the Central Intelligence Agency enjoys the same degree of confidence in Congress and among the American people which has been gained by the Atomic Energy Commission. And I do not believe the CIA will ever obtain it under present arrangements. On the contrary, all signs point to a steady loss of confidence. How could it be otherwise when we are left to wonder about the efficiency and economy of its operation, if the only assurances we have of the effectiveness of the service are those proffered by the men who run it?

Until a committee of the kind I am proposing is established, there will be no way of knowing what serious flaws in the Intelligence Agency may be covered by the curtain of secrecy in which it is shrouded. In 1949 the Hoover Commission examined the CIA. A task force stated that—

The Central Intelligence Agency has not yet achieved the desired degree of proficiency and dependability in its estimate. Without it, the National Security Council cannot succeed in assessing and appraising the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our . . . military power, with sufficient continuity or definiteness to constitute a practical guide to the Military Establishment as to the size of our military needs.

It recommended that vigorous steps be taken to improve the Central Intelligence Agency and its work.

Mr. President, have these steps been taken? We do not know and we have no way of finding out. Yet we are asked to go on appropriating vast funds without debate or question for this Agency.

Recently the Washington Star carried a story to the effect that CIA "has become so topheavy and unwieldy that it should be scrapped altogether and replaced by a new organization." Is this charge true? The columnist who reported this view said further that "our legislators feel strongly that there must be much overlapping and useless expenditure in the activities" of the five separate groups engaged in intelligence—CIA, the State Department, the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force. Is this charge true? He also wrote that "legislators who have been in close contact with the CIA believe that there is much deadwood in the organization which should be eliminated and it contains too many 'pals' of men with influence in the Government. Is this charge true?"

The fact is that we do not know whether these and other charges similarly unrelated to secrecy are true or not true. And if we are to appropriate funds for this Agency, we ought to know.

Neither do we know if CIA is staying within the limits established by law or if it has expanded beyond its original purposes. On December 30, 1952, the same columnist asserted that "the CIA established an intelligence service in the United States," although the law creating the Agency specifically prohibits it from "police, subpoena, law-enforcement powers or internal security functions." Yet, as was pointed out in an article in the New York Times on July 19, 1953, two CIA agents gave reports to the FBI that Owen Lattimore was about to leave this country. Nevertheless, they later refused on security grounds to testify in court on their role in this matter. Does this incident mean that the CIA is getting into the internal security field in competition with the FBI? Does it mean that officials of this Government Agency can defy the courts?

What of the quality of the product which CIA is producing? CIA officials claim that the United States intelligence system is second only to that of the Soviet Union. I do not know whether this is a boast of strength or a confession of weakness. Hanson Baldwin has reported that some observers believe it is actually not as effective, in terms of end results, as the British Secret Service with roughly 3,000 employees, or the Israeli service with roughly 300. Others believe that this country is spending too much money on intelligence for the results we are obtaining. The amount is a classified figure, but published estimates of the annual appropriation run from \$500 million to \$800 million. Personnel estimates in the press run between 8,000 and 30,000 employees.

Whatever the cost, we ought to be certain of the quality of our intelligence. Faulty intelligence estimates could jeopardize our entire defense and our foreign policy. Both of these must be based on cold knowledge and intelligent evaluation of the capabilities and intentions of other countries. If our premises are wrong, it is logical to assume that the policies based upon them will be wrong.

The Central Intelligence Agency plays a more direct role in foreign policy than that of simply providing some of the information on which our policies are based. It also serves, apparently, as an instrument of policy. Time magazine recently reported that—

Though CIA officials do not admit it publicly the agency was from the start engaged in a wide range of "covert activities," espionage aid to resistance movements and perhaps sabotage.

Exactly how many and what kind of activities are carried on, I do not know. This is a field in which information is even more closely guarded. Nevertheless, several such activities have been reported in the press, and we can assume that there have been others which have not made the headlines.

In the Washington Post of January 9, 1953, the following undertakings of CIA agents were cited as a "sampling of exploits which have been the subject of many whispered complaints":

1. Subsidization by CIA of a neo-Nazi organization which had marked for liquida-

tion the leaders of the Social Democratic Party.

The Social Democratic Party was the party of Ernst Reuter, later mayor of Berlin and vehement anti-Communist.

2. Incarceration for 3 months of a Japanese citizen under excuse of a pass-examination—a job initially undertaken by General Willoughby's Army Intelligence and passed on to CIA.

3. Tapping of the telephone of Jose Figueres, former Costa Rican President—

And, by the way, he is now President again—

at which a CIA man was caught red-handed. 4. Abortive effort by CIA undercover men to start a revolution in Guatemala and blame it on the United Fruit Co.

5. Burmese and Siamese and Vietnamese suspicions of CIA activity in promoting guerilla forays from the Burmese border into mainland China on the part of the tattered demoralized expellees among Chiang Kai-shek's defeated Nationalists.

I do not need to point out the tremendous impact which this sort of activity could have on our foreign policy. Other countries cannot be expected to distinguish between CIA policy and United States policy. If these reports are true, then it would appear to others that it was United States foreign policy to promote a neo-Nazi organization, to incarcerate a Japanese citizen, and start a revolution in one of our neighboring countries. Moreover, the Furma episode, according to the Washington Post, "led to the resignation in disgust of one of the best and most respected of our career Ambassadors on the ground not only that he did not go along with the black diplomacy around him, but that he was kept in ignorance of it." Is there any wonder that there should be increasing concern with the absence of control over this agency? We cannot permit CIA, any more than we can permit any other government agency, to have free reign to do anything it wants anywhere in the world. If its agents play carelessly with fire, the whole world might get burned.

I do not have official verification of any of the criticisms I have mentioned. All my information, as I have indicated, has been taken from public sources. But the point is that any of these reported incidents could be true, and we would not know the facts. Would it not be far more sensible if Congress were aware of the general policies being pursued by Central Intelligence? Is there any other way that we can be reasonably certain that public funds are not being wasted? That the country is getting the intelligence it needs for its protection?

If a joint committee is established, CIA officials would not have to seal their lips and put on the face of martyrdom, everytime they were criticized. They would have a congressional channel to present their side. The joint committee, in turn, could maintain the confidence of Congress and the public, without loss of security. Until we create some sort of "watchdog committee," however, we will have nothing but continued anxiety about the Central Intelligence Agency and its widespread activities.

It is characteristic of our system of government that we are suspicious, and rightly so, of unrestrained power. Technically, the CIA is part of the executive branch, and the executive branch is subject to the checks and balances of our Constitution. Actually the nature of its work, and its peculiar place in our governmental structure, have given this agency in effect a position inviting irresponsibility. At its best this makes for continued suspicion; at its worst it is a menace to free government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a letter dated August 25, 1953, written by me to the Director of Central Intelligence, and the reply which I received, dated September 4, 1953, signed by C. P. Cabell, lieutenant general, United States Air Force, Acting Director.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 25, 1953.

HON. ALLEN W. DULLES,
Director of Central Intelligence,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DULLES: As you know, I have introduced a bill to establish a joint congressional committee, along the lines of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for the CIA. I would appreciate receiving an answer from you on the questions listed below:

1. What is the present relationship between Congress and CIA?

(a) Before what committees, other than Appropriations, have CIA representatives appeared on agency business? Is there any regular survey of CIA's activities by any committee? What is CIA's procedure for getting desired legislation? How many Members of Congress know CIA's annual appropriation?

(b) In what instances do Members of Congress receive intelligence reports from CIA? Is it only when some other executive agency recommends it to support their position?

2. Does the Central Intelligence Agency feel that the present ties with Congress are adequate? What is its opinion of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy?

3. What action was taken on the Hoover Commission recommendation that vigorous efforts be made to improve the internal structure of the CIA and the quality of its product?

Must close now but hoping to hear from you soon, and with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., September 4, 1953.
The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: In Mr. Dulles' absence from the country, I am taking the liberty of replying to your letter of August 25, 1953, regarding CIA relations with the Congress. The answers below are numbered in accordance with the numbers of the questions in your letter.

1. (a) CIA representatives have appeared on Agency business before the following Senate committees: Armed Services, Government Operations (permanent Subcommittee on Investigations), Judiciary (Immigration Subcommittee), (Internal Security Subcommittee).

Agency representatives have appeared before the following House committees: Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Government Operations, Un-American Activities.

Agency representatives also have appeared before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and liaison is maintained with the Joint Committee on Printing.

Concerning regular surveys of CIA's activities by congressional committees, it should be noted that special subcommittees of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees receive a detailed briefing on the various aspects of CIA work in the course of the annual review of CIA's budget requirements. The Armed Services Committees also receive briefings on CIA, particularly in connection with CIA legislation. In addition, in connection with atomic energy, the joint committee is regularly advised of CIA's activities in this field.

CIA legislation is handled by the Armed Services Committee in both Houses.

The CIA appropriation figure is very tightly held and is known to not more than 5 or 6 Members in each House.

1. (b) The only committee which receives intelligence reports from CIA on a regular basis is the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Agency also makes certain information available to the Immigration Subcommittees of the Judiciary Committees of both Houses, and has also been of some assistance to the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

CIA intelligence reports are not made available merely to support the position of another executive agency, in fact there would probably be many instances in which CIA could give intelligence reports to certain other committees if requested.

2. It is our opinion that, from our point of view, the present ties with Congress are adequate. As far as we are able to determine, these ties are stronger than those which exist between any other nation's intelligence service and its legislative body.

In view of the fact that a decision to establish a joint congressional Committee on Central Intelligence involves many factors, some of which are not within the knowledge of CIA, it would not appear appropriate for CIA to express an opinion on the establishment of such a group.

3. At about the same time as the Hoover Commission subcommittee was making its study of intelligence in 1949, a special group appointed by the President, consisting of Mr. Allen Dulles, Mr. William H. Jackson, and Mr. Matthias F. Correa, was requested to make a detailed survey of CIA. At the time of the survey, these men were all in private life. Many of their recommendations, as well as those of the Hoover Commission, were carried into effect and were largely implemented upon the advent of General Smith as Director in October 1950 and Mr. Jackson as Deputy Director. This implementation has been carried forward by Mr. Dulles, who succeeded Mr. Jackson as Deputy Director, and subsequently succeeded General Smith as Director. While it is safe to say that no intelligence organization is ever completely satisfied with the quality of its end product, nevertheless, we feel, and have been informed by impartial observers, that the organization and the end product have been continuously and vigorously improved.

I know that Mr. Dulles would be happy to discuss this entire problem with you in greater detail at your convenience upon his return.

Sincerely,

C. P. CABELL,
Lieutenant General, USAF, Acting
Director.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks three editorials pertaining to the Central Intelligence Agency, all published in the Richmond News Leader.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader of March 30, 1953]

THE CIA: WHO WATCHES THE WATCHDOG?

In heavily guarded offices at 2430 E Street in Washington, on the grounds of the old naval hospital there, this Nation's Central Intelligence Agency directs the most secret and least publicized operations of the United States Government. Not even the Atomic Energy Commission functions with the secrecy of the CIA; the taxpayers know something of atomic research—how much it costs, in general how well it is succeeding, where the principal work is being done.

Of the CIA, whose expenditures are reckoned by well-informed observers at something in the neighborhood of \$1 billion a year, the taxpayer knows nothing.

This almost invisible agency of the Government came into existence in 1947, as the successor to an unwieldy central intelligence group that was organized after World War II. By way of background, it should be noted that prior to World War II, there was no American intelligence agency; we relied largely upon the reports of diplomatic and military officers, openly gathered at consulates, and embassies around the world. During the war, the cloak-and-dagger Office of Secret Services was set up to direct American espionage, but this went out of existence with the end of hostilities.

The National Security Act of 1947, creating the CIA, gave the new body some simple—and sweeping—duties. The CIA is to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government. By one provision it is specifically directed that the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure.

Even the sweeping terms of this enactment were regarded as inadequate by the CIA. So in June 1949 the administration obtained from Congress one of the most amazing laws ever put on the books—Public Law 110 of the 81st Congress. This is the law that makes CIA almost literally a law unto itself.

By this enactment, CIA is made exempt from all rules of purchasing that apply to other agencies. It may hire and fire at will, without regard to civil service regulations. All provisions of law and all regulations "relating to the expenditure of Government funds" are specifically waived for the CIA. It is above any law that might require "the publication or disclosure of the organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel employed by the Agency." The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is flatly instructed to make "no reports to the Congress" of CIA's expenditures, either lump sum or itemized. CIA spends what it pleases, as it pleases, "solely on the certificate of the Director, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified." No ordinary Congressman can touch it; no ordinary citizen is even admitted to the CIA's office.

For all the taxpayers know, the CIA may be doing an appallingly inefficient job. It may be wasting millions of dollars in fantastically extravagant and unnecessary schemes. It may be needlessly duplicating the work of other agencies. It may be the worst run bureaucracy in Washington. Westbrook Pegler has made the flat and unqualified charge that the CIA "slipped subsidies of millions of dollars to the AFL, [David] Dubinsky, the Garment Workers Union, and a mysterious group of persons unknown," in some nebulous venture to strengthen free trade unions in Europe against Communist infiltration. This charge

the CIA neither affirms nor denies; it simply evades answering.

From what little has been printed about the CIA, it is known that the Agency has had its internal difficulties. In October 1947 several employees were fired as "bad security risks." On another occasion, Senator McCarthy charged (with apparent accuracy) that a pervert dismissed from the State Department had turned up on CIA's payroll. The Agency came in for severe criticism when South Korea was invaded—to this Nation's total surprise—in June 1950 and again the following fall when the size of the Chinese Communist intervention was tragically underestimated. CIA was badly mousetrapped last year when it swallowed a false tip that Owen Lattimore was about to skip the country for Russia.

The extent of CIA's successful efforts is understandably unknown; in common with intelligence services everywhere, the Agency never mentions its successes. It is known that CIA had a hand in reporting Soviet Russia's first atomic explosion. Beyond that, nothing can be pinned down.

Of CIA's organization and routine, little has been officially disclosed. One account is that CIA has 5 major divisions—3 to collect information, 1 to index information, the fifth to evaluate the information and prepare the CIA's estimates. These estimates (originated by Gen. Walter Bedell Smith when he was director of CIA in 1950-52) are summaries of intelligence prepared by the agency for the President and other top officers of the Government. They arrive daily at the White House, it is said, mimeographed in purple ink and sealed in a blue folder. Other more extensive estimates are prepared weekly and monthly. These are compiled not merely from the reports of the CIA's espionage agents—the cloak-and-dagger spies of adventure fiction—but more matter-of-factly from the reports of Foreign Service observers, military and naval intelligence officers, immigration officials, narcotics inspectors in far-off corners of the world, and employees of the Treasury and Commerce Departments in foreign stations. It has been estimated that about 90 percent of CIA's work is no more secret than a Carnegie library, and the bulk of its work lies simply in correlating factual information that is lying around for anyone to pick up.

How many employees this worldwide operation involves, how much they are paid, how well they are doing their jobs, whether the jobs are worth doing—to all of these questions the CIA stands dumb. Of a few executives, some names and skeleton facts are known. The top brass include:

Allen Welsh Dulles, 59, director of the CIA; brother of the Secretary of State, graduate of Princeton and George Washington Universities, lawyer, in United States diplomatic service, at Vienna, Berne, Berlin, Constantinople, 1916-26, delegate to international conferences of 1925-33, attached to OSS in World War II.

Sherman Kent, 49, assistant director for national estimates; native of Chicago; graduate of Yale and member of Yale's faculty (professor of history) since 1928; chief of the Europe-Africa Division of OSS, 1941-45; State Department, 1946; instructor in National War College, 1947; author of *Strategic Intelligence* (1947).

Loftus E. Becker, 41, deputy director for intelligence; native of Buffalo; graduate of Harvard and Harvard Law School; lawyer; rose from private to major in World War II, served with Ninth Army in Europe, attended the Nuremberg trials as an adviser on German military organizations; joined CIA in April 1951.

Matthew Baird, 42, director of training; native of Ardmore, Pa., graduate of Princeton and Oxford; educator, former headmaster of the Arizona Desert School; served 44 months with Air Force in World War II,

mostly in South Pacific; resident of Arizona, cattle breeder and rancher.

Frank G. Wisner, 43, acting deputy director, native of Laurel, Miss., graduate of the University of Virginia; lawyer; served in World War II as a naval intelligence officer, later with OSS in Africa, Middle East, Balkans, France, and Germany; discharged as commander; with State Department, 1947, as deputy assistant Secretary of State for Occupied Areas; joined CIA, 1948.

Walter Reid Wolf, 58, deputy director; graduate of Yale; banker; vice president of National City Bank of New York since 1936; leader in many civic activities.

Charles Pearre Cabell, 49, director of the general staff; native of Dallas, graduate of West Point; holds rank of major general in the Air Force; formerly director of intelligence for the USAF, attended the Yalta Conference.

That about exhausts our notes on the CIA, and a thin batch of facts it is to work with. What disturbs us about the Central Intelligence Agency is this very thinness. To be sure, we recognize that some secret operations are necessary if this Nation is to be properly vigilant in the cold war, and secret operations would cease to be secret if they were conducted in klieg lights and full publicity. But we are far from certain that the sweeping secrecy of the CIA—extending even to its most routine operations—can be justified, or that the value of many of its investigations outweighs the old, established value of Government accountability directly to the people.

Congress long ago created a special committee to watch the Atomic Energy Commission, in part to keep a check on the day-to-day activities of men with tremendous power over mighty weapons. It would be in the public interest, as we see it, for a similar committee to be set up to watch the watchdogs of the CIA, to make spot-checks on expenditures, to keep budget requests in line, to see that secret policies laid down by the director of the CIA are not opposed to the people's wishes as the people's representatives understand them.

We are uneasy about this outfit—the power it holds, the secrecy with which it shrouds its operations, the potential for evil that lies in the CIA's virtually unchecked authority. And we commend to Congress a searching study of the powers it has vested in the agency. What Congress has given, Congress can take away—and in the case of the CIA, some taking away of excess power might prove exceedingly wise.

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader of July 17, 1953]

"ABOUT WHICH YOU ACTUALLY KNOW NOTHING"

One of our more articulate critics, in a letter full of strawmen and ad hominem arguments, takes us severely to task in the Forum today for an editorial of July 13. In that editorial we reviewed the astonishing law under which the Central Intelligence Agency is permitted to conceal every aspect of its operations—including the size of its budget and the length of its payroll—from the American people. At no time has this newspaper suggested that CIA activity be fully revealed to the American people. What we have demanded is an amendment to the basic CIA law that would provide some measure of public accountability for funds, and place some restrictions upon the CIA's now unlimited opportunities for international troublemaking.

One phrase in Mr. Lucas' letter serves to buttress the point we have been making. He says we are spreading mistrust of an agency about which you actually know nothing discreditable. Knock off the last word: We most assuredly mistrust an agency of Government about which we actually know nothing. The CIA is responsible not to the

people of the United States, in the sense that the people are permitted to form their own opinions of whether they are getting value received, but solely to the National Security Council—a group of top Government officials who have a thousand other concerns and cannot possibly maintain a close check on the CIA's day-to-day spending.

Nothing like the CIA exists anywhere in the American Government. The Atomic Energy Commission deals in secrets of the most vital nature, yet the AEC's budget is a matter of public record; the AEC publishes an annual report; a special committee of Congress keeps a watchdog eye on its activities; the AEC's budget is not sacrosanct, and can be trimmed whenever the American people conclude that too much money is being poured into atomic research. The FBI is a highly secret outfit, yet it is no secret that the FBI spent nearly \$70 million in the last fiscal year, and that it employs some 14,000 persons whose average salary is \$4,800. Similarly, the defense establishment deals constantly in matters of the deepest secrecy, yet the budgets of Army, Navy, and Air Force are available for any citizen's inspection. No one in his right mind would suggest that every American should have a pass to the Pentagon's code room, or access to Secretary Wilson's private files; yet the very essence of the American form of government by the people is reflected in the fact that the people are kept fully informed on military spending and can check the high brass whenever the spirit moves them to do so.

None of this applies to the Central Intelligence Agency. It is a separate and clandestine entity in our Government. One of the most reliable budgetary reports in Washington has told us that he believes CIA's spending "is in the neighborhood of a billion dollars a year," yet no committee of Congress can check on this figure nor can the beleaguered American people find out whether the CIA is worth its cost—whatever the cost may be. Funds may be transferred to the CIA from other agencies of the Government "without regard to any provisions of law limiting or prohibiting transfers between appropriations." Surely that clause in the CIA Act makes a mockery of congressional control over the public purse.

No restrictions are laid upon the CIA's activities. The status reads that "Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, sums made available to the agency by appropriations or otherwise may be expended for purposes necessary to carry out its functions." The CIA, of course, decides for itself what its functions are. The law specifically approves expenditures for "personal services without regard to limitations on types of persons to be employed; radio receiving and radio-sending equipment; purchase, maintenance, and cleaning of firearms, including purchase, storage, and maintenance of ammunition; acquisition of necessary land; construction of buildings and facilities without regard to 36 Statutes, 399, 40 United States Code 259, 267."

All sums made available to the CIA "may be expended without regard to the provisions of law and regulations relating to the expenditure of Government funds and for objects of a confidential, extraordinary, or emergency nature, such expenditures to be accounted for solely on the certificate of the Director, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified."

We deny, as vigorously as we know how, that any such sweeping concealment is in the public interest. The most effective restraint yet devised on the extravagant ambitions of Government officials is the vigilant watch of the American people and the American press. Once that restraint is wiped out, and power is permitted to be unchecked in the darkness, waste and corruption are provided a fertile soil in which to grow. Certainly we mistrust the CIA—and we will

continue to spread that mistrust in the fervent hope that others will awake to the dangers inherent in this unknown and unknowable OGPU in our midst.

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader of July 24, 1954]

TO WATCH THE CIA

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, this week offered a resolution that merits widespread and immediate public support. He proposes the establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, to be patterned after the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

"The CIA is in somewhat the same category as the AEC," Senator MANSFIELD said, "and just as a special committee, with well-defined authority and powers has been created on a joint congressional basis to oversee and supervise the interests of the AEC, so I believe should a joint congressional committee be created for the same purpose in connection with the CIA * * * for purposes of seeing that good management is maintained in the CIA and also to keep a constant check on its intelligence policies. It is well, too, that this joint committee should be in a position to criticize any mistakes which the CIA may make."

This newspaper has been urging the creation of such a committee for the past several months. At present the CIA is wholly beyond the reach of the Congress that created it. The agency's budget is secret; its payroll is secret; its employees are under orders to ignore congressional committees and to refuse to answer their questions. By law the CIA has unlimited authority to spend virtually unlimited amounts of money for wholly unlimited purposes. Neither the Congress nor the public has any way of knowing whether the CIA is doing a good job or a terrible job, whether it is wasting millions or spending its funds with scrupulous care.

Senator MANSFIELD's proposed committee has been needed for a long time. We commend his resolution warmly to Virginia's delegation on the Hill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS, REGULAR ARMY

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURCELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to my earlier announcement, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5509, to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, relating to the percentage of colonels in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army.

I might say to the acting minority leader that the other bill which I had contemplated might be called up today I have agreed to have go over until at least Friday, because tomorrow the time for debate will be controlled.

So far as I know, there was no objection to the Medical Service Corps bill in the committee, but I will address an inquiry to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], who is representing the Armed Services Committee in connection with the bill. I understand no minority views were filed.

Mr. DUFF. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, I may say that I understand that the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services has no objection to the bill.

Mr. DUFF. The Senator is correct; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] raised no objection, and there was no objection to the bill in the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5509) to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, relating to the percentage of colonels in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I might say, before the Senate acts on the bill, that I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania is prepared to make a statement about the bill for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to repeal an existing provision of law which limits the number of permanent colonels in the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army to 2 percent of the authorized Regular Army officer strength of that corps. This 2-percent limitation contrasts with a limitation of 8 percent which is applicable to all other male arms and branches of the Army.

The 2-percent limitation was included in the original legislation as recommended by the Department of the Army. The basis for the limitation was the number of positions justifying officers of this permanent rank in the then existing tables of organization for Medical Service Corps officers.

Since the Army-Navy Medical Service Corps Act of 1947 was enacted, the Department of the Army has significantly broadened the utilization of Medical Service Corps officers, with the result that today there are many additional areas and positions of responsibility for officers of the Medical Service Corps that did not exist in 1947.

The Department of the Army is attempting to relieve medical and dental officers from administrative and managerial duties, so that they may devote more time to the exercise of their professional duties and qualifications. Army representatives maintain that the full achievement of the objective of relieving professional officers of administrative and managerial duties is hindered by the 2-percent limitation which restricts career opportunities for Medical Service Corps officers.

Furthermore, the continued existence of this limitation handicaps the Army in procuring and retaining officers who possess the educational, scientific, and

technical qualifications desired in the Medical Service Corps.

Enactment of this bill will enable the Medical Service Corps to have the same percentage of officers serving in the permanent grade of colonel as is now authorized for the other arms and branches of the Army. Notwithstanding this fact, Army representatives have assured the committee that the enactment of this bill will not result in full utilization of the authority in the near future. The additional positions of permanent colonel would be filled gradually during the next few years, as officers become qualified and demonstrate the ability to serve in this grade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5509) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5337) to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SHORT, Mr. ARENDT, Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. SHAFER, Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, and Mr. KILDAY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. JACKSON obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield at this time, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to add as title II of the Hawaiian statehood bill the bill reported from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs providing statehood for Alaska.

I should like to make it clear at the outset that I have always supported statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska.

May 10, 1954

MANSTFIELD-CIA
WASHINGTON (AP) - SEN. MANSTFIELD MOVED TODAY FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT

OF A JOINT SENATE AND HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE WHICH WOULD ACT AS A CONGRESSIONAL WATCHDOG ON ACTIVITIES OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

"THE COMMITTEE WOULD BE SET UP ALONG THE SAME LINES AS THE JOINT ATOMIC ENERGY COMMITTEE," MANSTFIELD TOLD A REPORTER. "I THINK WE'VE NEEDED SOMETHING LIKE THIS FOR A LONG TIME."

MANSTFIELD PLANNED TO INTRODUCE HIS RESOLUTION, IN WHICH HE WAS JOINED BY 20 OTHER SENATORS--15 DEMOCRATS AND 5 REPUBLICANS--WITH A PREPARED FLOOR SPEECH IN WHICH HE SAID:

"EVENTS DURING THE PAST YEAR HAVE CONVINCED ME THAT AN URGENT NEED EXISTS FOR REGULAR AND RESPONSIBLE CONGRESSIONAL SCRUTINY OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

"SUCH SCRUTINY IS ESSENTIAL TO THE SUCCESS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY, TO THE PRESERVATION OF OUR DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES, AND TO THE SCRUTINY OF THE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ITSELF.

"THE SOONER WE PROVIDE A LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR PROPER CONGRESSIONAL-CIA RELATIONS, THE QUICKER WE CAN BEGIN TO BUILD MUTUAL CONFIDENCE."

GG257P 3/10

STAT

Approved For Release 2005/04/13 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600020015-4

Approved For Release 2005/04/13 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600020015-4